

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/657,998		09/09/2003	Ray Parsonage	02894-427003 / 80041.2	2282	
26161	7590	10/26/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FISH & R P.O. BOX		OSON PC		HAMILTON, ISAAC N		
		N 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3724		
				DATE MAILED: 10/26/200	DATE MAILED: 10/26/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application/Control Number: 10/657,998 Page 2

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species in figure 1B, claims 49-60 and 62-67 in the reply filed on 08/08/2005 is acknowledged.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because "said" is recited in line 4. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 54 recites the limitation "the skin-engaging surfaces" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 10/657,998

Art Unit: 3724

Page 3

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- Claims 49, 50, 55-60, 62, 65 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Braun et al (3,768,348), hereafter Braun. Braun discloses first shaving unit 51, 5, 3; first outer cutter 51; first under cutter 5; frame 13; skin agitation member 7; housing 11; drive source 1; second frequency lower than first frequency in column 5, lines 4-16; outer cutter 71; second undercutter 72; gearing 2; first undercutter eccentric pin 30 and drive coupling 3, 40, 41, 42; skin agitation member eccentric pin 80 and drive coupling 8, 91, 92; first outer cutter inherently has a low friction outer surface because it is smooth foil; gearbox is the area adjacent to elements 23, 24, 20, 21; first drive shaft 22; first gear means 24; first eccentric camming element 30; second drive shaft 25; second gear means 23; second eccentric camming element 80; first follower means 3; second follower means 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 51, 52, 53, 54, 63, 64 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Braun in view of Tanahashi et al (5,398,412), hereafter Tanahashi. Braun discloses everything as noted above, but does not disclose an additional shaving unit, a movable

Art Unit: 3724

shaving unit, and does not teach a shaving unit floatably mouted. However, Tanahashi teaches additional shaving unit 10; movable shaving unit in column 8, lines 1-8; shaving unit floatably mounted in column 1, lines 49-53. It would have been obvious to provide an additional shaving unit, a movable shaving unit and a floatably mouned shaving unit in Braun as taught by Tanahashi in order to cut a larger area with the shaving apparatus, apply the shaving apparatus to restricted areas and to apply the shaving apparatus with higher pressure to a surface. Note in Tanahashi, second outer cutter 20; third undercutter 21; driven at same frequency in column 4, lines 28-32; outer cutters are stationary and inactive; skin engaging surfaces are the outer surfaces of outer cutters and are coplanar as seen in figure 3.

10. Claims 51, 52, 53, 54 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Braun. Braun discloses the claimed invention except for an additional shaving unit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the additional shaving unit for the purpose of increasing cutting efficiency by providing more cutter surface area. It has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac Hamilton whose telephone number is 571-272-4509. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday between 8am and 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ΙH

October 25, 2005

Tripethy V. Eley Primary Examine;